

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing Amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-23 are pending in the application, with 1, 10 and 23 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12-15, 19, and 20. Also by this Amendment, Applicant adds claims 21-23. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated, the claim amendments are for purposes of clarity and not to overcome any other rejections in the Official Action.

Based on the above and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Official Action objects to claims 8 and 9 because of informalities. Specifically, the Official Action states that in line 2 of claims 8 and 9, "a" must be substituted with --said--. Appropriate correction was required. The requested corrections are made in claims 8 and 9, and respectively in claims 19 and 20.

Claims 4 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 4 and 15 for the reasons stated below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sternglass in view of Monney.

Claim 1 was amended to illustrate that the braces attached to the back plate are stowable. The braces, which are used to support and adapt to different digital devices, are stowable when not in use. The braces are also stowable to facilitate folding of the back plate onto the folded keyboard for compact storage. Sternglass and Monney lack this element. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1. Claims 21 and 22 are added as dependent on claim 1. Therefore, Applicant also requests the allowance of claims 2-9, 21, and 22.

In addition, Claim 1 was amended to replace "a plurality" of stowable braces with "one or more" stowable braces to be consistent with the language of the detailed description where it states, in paragraph 34 line 2, "one or more support braces." Respectively, claims 2-4 and 12-15 were amended to replace the "plurality of" language.

Claims 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sternglass/Monney as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Igushi.

The Official Action states on page 4, lines 18-19, that "Iguchi teaches a stem being rotatable to align a sensor with a port of a digital device for communication (see figure 11 and col. 3, line 50-53)." Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees.

First, the Iguchi reference in figure 11 and col. 3, lines 50-53, refers to the "receiver of wireless signals" as element 15. Element 15 "is positioned at an outer wall on a side cabinet of the main unit, **where the top 12 is pivotally fixed.**" It is not the

"receiver of wireless signals" (element 15) that is "pivotally fixed," but the folding "top" (element 12). This is evidenced by the fact the words "top 12" immediately proceed "is pivotally fixed" in the same clause.

Second, figure 11 does not teach a rotatable stem signal receiver. There is no teaching of "pivoting" or "rotating" in the description of figure 11 (see col. 5, lines 24-35). Rather, this figure illustrates the range of reception of a permanently fixed and non-rotational signal receiver. This is also evidenced by lines 24-28 stating that figure 11 "is a plan view showing a position relation between the main unit 1 and the cordless key unit 2 and **an available range** for transmitting/receiving them."

As a result, Iguchi does not teach "a stem being rotatable to align a sensor with a port of a digital device for communication." Sternglass and Monney also lack this element. For at least these reasons, independent claim 10 and respective dependent claims 11-20 should be allowed.

As Iguchi does not teach a stem being rotatable to align a sensor with a port of a digital device, Applicant requests that claim 23 be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jon E. Wright
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,720

Date: August 8, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

398148_1.DOC